

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENTTED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Gnited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bact 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,240	07/30/2003	Robert Bradley	EKT-1001US	9389
21302 75	590 02/24/2005		EXAMINER	
KNOBLE, YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVY			MULCAHY, PETER D	
EIGHT PENN (SUITE 1350, 10	CENTER 628 JOHN F KENNEDY B	LVD	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PHILADELPH			1713	
			DATE MAILED: 02/24/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	(00			
Office Action Summary		10/630,240	BRADLEY ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Peter D. Mulcahy	1713				
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addres	SS			
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION AND COMMUNICATION IN THE PROPERTY OF THE PR	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thieriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tatute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rly (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this commu BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	inication.			
Status							
1)[🗆	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	05 January 2005.					
·		This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction as	drawn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Exar	niner.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) ☐ objected to	by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co The oath or declaration is objected to by the	·	-	• •			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for force All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Busee the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stag	je			
Attachmen	t(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
3) 🛛 Infor	ne of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE or No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/21/03</u> .		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 1713

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aguirre et al. US 5,656,680.

The claims are directed to a particular silica dispersing agent and its use in vulcanized rubber compositions. The elected specie of dispersing agent is dodecyl benzene sulfonic acid. The rubber compositions claimed include additional ingredients which are routinely used in rubber processing.

The Aguirre et al. patent shows vulcanized rubber compositions and is directed to processing aids and peptizing agents used as such. This patent identifies the claimed dodecyl benzene sulfonic acid (col. 10, lines 8-9) as the preferred peptizing agent.

Page 3

Art Unit: 1713

The difference between the instantly claimed invention and the prior art is that the art fails to provide an example of each of the claimed ingredients used in the claimed amounts.

The instantly claimed invention is rendered prima facie obvious from the prior art because the incorporation of the dodecyl benzene sulfonic acid is suggested through out the disclosure. The claimed rubbers are shown at column 10 lines 54-64. The use of the claimed sulfur as a vulcanizing agent is shown in the examples, TABLE 1 at columns 11 & 12. The claimed silica is shown at column 17, line 10. The use of the rubber compositions in tire applications is suggested at column 12, lines 31.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the shown ingredients in combination with one another as claimed given that each of the ingredients is shown and suggested to be used in combination with one another.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter D. Mulcahy whose telephone number is 571-272-1107. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on 571-272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/630,240

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1713

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Peter D. Mulcahy Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1/713

2/22/05